

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

DATE: July 6, 2021

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2107062

TO: Chairwoman Lisa Cupid
ATTN TO: Jeannie Peyton, Senior Planner
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact Review



Digital signature
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed a preliminary regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This preliminary report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

Name of Proposal: White Road Site DRI #3341

Review Type: DRI

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County

Date Opened: July 6, 2021

Deadline for Comments: July 21, 2021

Date to Close: July 21, 2021*

**This is an expedited review because it is expected to generate fewer than 1,000 new daily trips. If no major issues are raised, the review will close the same day comments close.*

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal to build two distribution warehouses on a 41-acre site in unincorporated Cobb County on White Road, about 3,000 feet north of Riverside Parkway. Two buildings totaling 569,160 SF are proposed. The nearest state routes are Interstate 20 at Riverside Parkway and Thornton Road (SR 6) at Riverside Parkway or Switch Way. The applicant is seeking expedited GRTA review with fewer than 1,000 trips. The local trigger action is a Land Disturbance Permit. The existing zoning is Heavy Industrial. Expected buildout is one phase in 2022.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the Unified Growth Policy Map, this project is located in the Established Suburbs of the region. General policy recommendations for this area, as well as Industrial & Logistics Areas, are listed at the end of these comments.

This project generally follows regional recommendations for similar projects. It proposes two distribution warehouses in an existing industrial area and is expected to generate fewer than 1,000 new daily trips, qualifying it for expedited review by Georgia Regional Transportation Authority. Under new GRTA review rules enacted in April 2021, the applicant prepared a memorandum focusing on potential impacts of Heavy Vehicles, which require different design considerations for local roadways. That memo identifies locations

for truck staging and overflow, which is a frequent issue raised by other local governments for similar projects. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Group are attached.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design, e.g., pervious pavers, rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc., in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages. Additional comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group are attached.

Further to the above, Developing Suburbs are areas that were constructed from around 1995 to today. These areas are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. General policy recommendations include:

- New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged
- Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities
- Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space
- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off
- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

Because these recommendations don't fully address the proposed in a largely industrial location, policy recommendations for Regional Industrial & Logistics Areas are provided below. This area will see increased job growth in the form of industrial and logistics space. Strategies are needed to avoid residential and industrial conflicts while still allowing both uses in proximity to each other, without limiting the operations of industrial land users.

- Protect Industrial and Logistics Areas by not allowing conflicting land uses in the vicinity
- Identify key areas to preserve for freight and industrial uses
- Continue to promote Industrial and Logistics Areas as a major resource in recruiting future economic development prospects to the region
- Ensure the continued efficiency of cargo and freight transport with easy connectivity to trucking and shipping routes through the region

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DOUGLAS COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GRTA/SRTA

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (470) 378-1645 or asmith@atlantaregional.org. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews>.



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: **White Road Site DRI #3341** *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: ()

Signature:

Date:

Comments must be emailed to:

Andrew Smith
Atlanta Regional Commission
asmith@atlantaregional.org
Ph. (470) 378-1645

Return Date: July 21, 2021

DATE: July 6, 2021

TO: ARC Group Managers

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Community Development: Smith, Andrew

Transportation Access and Mobility: Little, Aries

Natural Resources: Santo, Jim

Research and Analytics: Skinner, Jim

Aging and Health Resources: Perumbeti, Katie

Name of Proposal: White Road Site DRI #3341

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal to build two distribution warehouses on a 41-acre site in unincorporated Cobb County on White Road, about 3,000 feet north of Riverside Parkway. Two buildings totaling 569,160 SF are proposed. The nearest state routes are Interstate 20 at Riverside Parkway and Thornton Road (SR 6) at Riverside Parkway or Switch Way. The applicant is seeking expedited GRTA review with fewer than 1,000 trips. The local trigger action is a Land Disturbance Permit. The existing zoning is Heavy Industrial. Expected buildout is one phase in 2022.

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County

Date Opened: July 6, 2021

Deadline for Comments: July 21, 2021

Date to Close: July 21, 2021

- 1) ☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 5) ☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 6) ☐ Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

[illegible]



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)
[Tier Map](#)
[Apply](#)
[View Submissions](#)
[Login](#)

DRI #3341

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Cobb
Individual completing form: Jeannie Peyton
Telephone: 770-528-2022
E-mail: jeannie.peyton@cobbcounty.org

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: White Road Site
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Latitude: 33.761 Longitude: -84.577
Brief Description of Project: The site is located east of Bob White Road in the vicinity of Village Drive. It is an industrial development on 41-acres of land, consisting of two Industrial warehouse buildings that total 569,160 SF.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 569,160 SF Warehouse

Developer: Strategic Real Estate Partners (Kevin Casteel)

Mailing Address: 3715 Northside Parkway

Address 2: Building 400, Suite 425

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30327

Telephone: 706-576-1549

Email: kcasteel@strategicpartners.com

Is property owner different from developer/applicant? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, property owner: John Williams, Mountain Reserve, LLC, and Barry Wood

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide the following information: Project Name:
Project ID:

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

- ☐ Rezoning
- ☐ Variance
- ☐ Sewer
- ☐ Water
- ☒ Permit
- ☒ Other BOC Zoning - Other Business

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: Project Overall project: 2022

[Back to Top](#)



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Logout](#)

Thank you for submitting your application. The DRI Application Number is 3341. To view the application at any time, you can go to <http://apps.dca.ga.gov/DRI/AppSummary.aspx?driid=3341>. Please contact your RDC if you have any questions or need to change any of the information on this form.

DRI #3341

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Cobb
Individual completing form: Jeannie Peyton
Telephone: 770-528-2022
Email: jeannie.peyton@cobbcounty.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: White Road Site
DRI ID Number: 3341
Developer/Applicant: Strategic Real Estate Partners (Kevin Casteel)
Telephone: 706-576-1549
Email(s): kcasteel@strategicpartners.com

Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)
☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?
☒ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$55,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$700,000

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Will this development displace any existing uses?
☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Cobb County

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.05 MGD

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: Cobb County

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.04 MGD

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? 0.32

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) 944 new daily trips (94 net AM trips, 96 net PM trips)

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below: To be determined in traffic impact study

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 1042 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? 57.6

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: One wet detention pond is being proposed to mitigate the development's impact on stormwater management. A proprietary device is also being proposed to meet local stormwater requirement of 80% TSS removal.

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Wetlands? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No
4. Protected mountains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Protected river corridors? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Floodplains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
7. Historic resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:
Proposed development will impact a stream, and associated wetlands on site. The proposed impacts have been submitted for individual permit and stream buffer variance

[Back to Top](#)

You are logged in to the DRI Website as **ggiuffrida** | [Change Password](#) | [Go to Applications Listing](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)

SANDTOWN VILLAGE DRI
City of South Fulton
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
May 25, 2021

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified City and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Watershed Protection

The project property is located in the portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed drains into the Chattahoochee River Corridor, but it is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is not subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act or the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. This portion of the watershed drains into the Chattahoochee downstream of the existing public water supply intakes on the Chattahoochee. However, proposed intakes in South Fulton and Coweta County would include this portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed as a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. However, for large water supply watersheds without a water supply reservoir, the only applicable Part 5 requirements are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of a public water supply intake. This property is more than seven miles upstream of the nearest proposed public water supply intake.

Stream Buffers

The USGS coverage for the project area no tributary streams on the property. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the requirements of the Cobb County Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any unmapped waters of the State on the property may subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers.

Stormwater/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3341
DRI Title White Road
County Cobb County
City (if applicable) N/A
Address / Location North of Village Drive along White Road

Proposed Development Type:

It is proposed to develop two distribution warehouses, which totals 569,160 square feet of industrial space, on an industrial site approximately 41-acres.

Build Out : 2022

Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Aries Little
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date July 6, 2021

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley-Horn
Date June 30, 2021

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

- 01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?**

☒ YES (provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)

On page 6 of the Methodology Package, a list of programmed projects was provided. The projects are not within the study area; however, the projects are on major transportation corridors surrounding the project area.

☐ NO (provide comments below)

REGIONAL NETWORKS

- 02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?**

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☒ NO

The development site is not directly served by a Regional Thoroughfare. However, there are surrounding thoroughfares that could be used to access the development site. These thoroughfares are Riverside Parkway, Thornton Road, and I-20.

☐ YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☒ NO

Although the development site is not directly served by a Regional Truck Route, there are three routes surrounding the site: SR 6, SR 70, and I-20.

☐ YES (*identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points*)

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*nearest station more than one mile away*)

☐ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (*provide additional information below*)

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

[Click here to enter name of operator and rail line](#)

- Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile
- Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)
- [Click here to provide comments.](#)
- Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)
- Transit Connectivity ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
☐ No services available to rail station
☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- ☒ NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- ☐ YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - ☐ CST planned within TIP period
 - ☐ CST planned within first portion of long range period
 - ☐ CST planned near end of plan horizon

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the connection a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☐ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s) [Click here to enter name of operator\(s\).](#)

Bus Route(s) [Click here to enter bus route number\(s\).](#)

Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☐ NO

☒ YES

MARTA and CobbLinc operates within the jurisdiction and there is a SRTA Xpress route nearby.

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

[Click here to provide name of facility.](#)

Distance

☐ Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

- ☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

* *Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site*

Although there are no trails or sidewalks within a mile of the development, the site plans do illustrate a 5ft. wide sidewalk along the property's frontage.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (*connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development*)
- ☐ YES (*stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop*)
- ☒ NO (*the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop*)
- ☐ OTHER (*Please explain*)

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- ☐ YES (*sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network*)
- ☐ PARTIAL (*some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct*)
- ☐ NO (*walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent*)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips*)
- ☐ OTHER (*Please explain*)

There are no proposed bicycle improvements. The internal proposed sidewalks will be adjacent to the buildings only.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- ☒ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☐ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☐ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

Although there is a proposed truck court to accommodate heavy vehicle staging and overflow, it appears that one of truck courts could potentially impact the site's driveway.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?**

- ☐ UNKNOWN *(additional study is necessary)*
- ☒ YES *(based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)*
- ☐ NO *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

- 14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?**

- ☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*
- ☐ YES *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

- 15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):**

